

USCA4 Appeal: 21-7365

Doc: 20

Filed: 08/30/2023

Pg: 1 of 2

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 21-7365**

---

MICHAEL JERMAINE GREENE,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SIDNEY FEASTER; DOUG WHITE,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia, at  
Wheeling. John Preston Bailey, District Judge. (5:16-cv-00051-JPB-MJA)

---

Submitted: May 25, 2023

Decided: August 30, 2023

---

Before KING, WYNN, and RUSHING, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Michael Jermaine Greene, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Michael Jermaine Greene appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to Defendants on Greene's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 complaint. On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Greene's informal brief does not challenge the basis for the district court's disposition, he has forfeited appellate review of the court's order. *See Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) ("The informal brief is an important document; under Fourth Circuit rules, our review is limited to issues preserved in that brief."). Accordingly, although we grant Greene leave to proceed in forma pauperis,<sup>\*</sup> we affirm the district court's judgment. We deny Greene's motions for appointment of counsel and to remand this case to the district court. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

*AFFIRMED*

---

<sup>\*</sup> While incarcerated, Greene sought leave under the Prison Litigation Reform Act (PLRA), 28 U.S.C. § 1915, to proceed on appeal without prepayment of fees. Greene now represents that he has been paroled, meaning that he is no longer subject to the PLRA. *See DeBlasio v. Gilmore*, 315 F.3d 396, 398-99 (4th Cir. 2003). For this reason, we construe his PLRA motion as an application to proceed in forma pauperis.